

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/518,573	12/22/2004	Kurt Blechinger	BLECHINGER ET AL-1PCT	6846	
25889 WILLIAM CO	7590 05/24/2007 DLLARD		EXAMINER		
COLLARD & ROE, P.C. 1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD			SHAW, CLIFFORD C		
ROSLYN, NY			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
·			1725		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Occurs	10/518,573	BLECHINGER ET	AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Clifford C. Shaw	1725	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. hely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 M</u> 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar	action is non-final.	osecution as to the	e merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	•		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 27-29,34-40 and 45-52 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 27-29,34-40 and 45-52 is/are rejected 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	• • •		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			ED 4 404(4)
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	es have been received. es have been received in Application of the second of the secon	ion No ed in this Nationa	l Stage
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Detailed Action

1.) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2.) Claims 27-29, 34-40, and 45-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodge et al. (6,795,778). Figure 8 and the discussion at columns 12-13 in Dodge et al. (6,795,778) disclose a method and apparatus with features claimed, including: detecting operating states at 810; processing the detected states at 820, 830, and 840; transmitting messages to external receivers at 860. In regard to claim 51, see figure 3, the sixth row of the table wherein a thermostat is disclosed. In regard to claim 52, note the discussion of a camera in column 12, lines 28-31. The claims differ from the teachings of Dodge et al. (6,795,778) in calling for: processing the detected states "according to stored specifications" and comparing the

Application/Control Number: 10/518,573

Art Unit: 1725

operating states with the stored state; and in calling for a "standardized interface" to transmit the detected operating states in claims 34 and 45. These differences do not patentably distinguish over the prior art. In regard to storing specifications and comparing the stored state to an operating state, it is considered obvious that the determination of an element or foult condition in

Page 3

over the prior art. In regard to storing specifications and comparing the stored state to an operating state, it is considered obvious that the determination of an alarm or fault condition in Dodge et al. (6,795,778) (as for example in element 840 of figure 8) must obviously involve a stored value or state and a comparison as claimed as this would be a convenient manner to determine the existence of a fault or error. In column 5, lines 10-15, the patent to Dodge et al. (6,795,778) suggests that an overcurrent can be determined by comparison with a stored threshold value and it would have been obvious to have used this general approach with any suitable alarm or fault condition in the system of Dodge et al. (6,795,778). In regard to claims 34 and 45, the output of the sensors in the system of Dodge et al. (6,795,778) must be converted to a format useable by the data processing system. It is considered obvious that this conversion constitutes a "standardized interface" because the requirements of the data processing system must be standard to some extent (at the very least, the system would obviously be standardized around a binary format).

3.) Applicant's arguments filed 3/5/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant discusses a scenario whereby his invention can be used to detect the operating state of a welding wire supply coil and can transmit the appropriate notification when supplies run short. Applicant also suggests that the invention could be used to detect overcurrent of the welding wire feed motor. Applicant asserts that the Dodge patent does not teach or suggest his invention. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The claims do not have any

Art Unit: 1725

limitations directed to a welding wire supply or to welding wire feed motors. The patent to Dodge discloses a method for operating a welding apparatus and a welding apparatus with rapid detection of certain operating states and transmission of the same to external receivers. The claims are obvious over this patent as discussed above.

4.) **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Clifford C Shaw at telephone number 571-272-1182. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday of the first week of the pay period and on Tuesday through Friday of the second week of the pay period.

Art Unit: 1725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Patrick J. Ryan, can be reached at 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Clifford C Shaw Primary Examiner Art Unit 1725

May 17, 2007